DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 401 313 TM 025 881

AUTHOR Ridley, Dennis R.
TITLE Assessment Plan for CNU Online (1996 Revision).
PUB DATE 15 May 96
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Computer Uses in Education; Course Evaluation; *Distance Education; Educational Planning; *Educational Technology; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Online Systems; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS *Christopher Newport University VA

ABSTRACT

This assessment plan is being developed to provide evidence of the effectiveness of the implementation of CNU Online, the online course delivery system of Christopher Newport University (Virginia). The evaluation of the program is designed to satisfy appropriate standards for methodological rigor and scholarly integrity. There are three focuses to the assessment: (1) student outcomes; (2) course-based comparisons of online and classroom courses; and (3) program outcomes. Student outcomes, the traditional subject of evaluation, are the basis for the assessment, and were generally defined as the courses were established. Course-based comparisons will usually be in terms of the student outcomes, with special attention to the knowledge and skills taught in the course. The practical arrangements for comparisons will depend on circumstances, particularly in situations where the same course is taught online and in the classroom by the same professor or by different professors. In considering program outcomes, it is necessary to look at the program of online instruction as well as the specific degree program pursued. At present, only one degree program is offered online. As the evaluation progresses, development of an appropriate reporting mechanism is needed. An appendix contains the instructional evaluation survey for the assessment. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DENNIS R. RIDLEY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 401 313

ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR CNU ONLINE (1996 REVISION)

by

Dennis R. Ridley, PhD
Director of Assessment and Evaluation
Christopher Newport University

May 15, 1996

Christopher Newport University
50 Shoe Lane
Newport News, Virginia 23606-2988

TM025881

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR CNU ONLINE (1996 REVISION)

PREFACE

CNU Online is the computer-managed instructional delivery system of Christopher Newport University. Fully functioning to deliver wholly online courses since fall, 1994, CNU Online has been utilizing an officially-approved "Assessment Plan for CNU Online" (1) since January 14, 1995. The revised version has been written with the help of broad faculty input and experience over the past three semesters. This assessment plan is intended to guide local efforts. It is also offered as a contribution to the burgeoning field of online instructional delivery.

ASSESSMENT PLAN FOR CNU ONLINE (1996 REVISION)

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this assessment plan is to provide evidence of effectiveness in meeting the goals of CNU Online by employing accepted and approved standards of assessment. These standards will be consistent with state (State Council of Higher Education for Virginia--SCHEV) and regional (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools--SACS) guidelines. Since the program being evaluated is relatively new and highly innovative, the methods used will require resourcefulness and innovation. The emphasis will be on utility in delivering results.

The timing and the nature of the assessment process will satisfy appropriate standards of methodological rigor and scholarly integrity. In order to meet deadlines and work within the operating budget, there will be a phased implementation of the assessment plan. The implementation schedule will be consistent with SCHEV's reporting requirements.

Assessment plans and procedures described in this document are subject to review and revision in the light of subsequent experience. A review of the plan will be undertaken annually and changes made, if needed. Broad input will be sought from persons most experienced with the online system. On occasion external consultants may be used. Such review went into creating this first revision of the plan.

STATE AND REGIONAL GUIDELINES REGARDING ASSESSMENT

State and regional guidelines are relevant to assessment of student outcomes and the broader evaluation of programs. CNU Online is regarded as a supplement to the on-campus academic program. Thus, generally, the internal program review and assessment procedures applying to the on-campus programs also apply to CNU Online. However, both state (SCHEV) and regional (SACS) review criteria recently have required reviewing CNU Online under the special category of "distance learning." Computer-managed instruction invites close scrutiny from such bodies because of its novelty and potential as an alternative form of instruction. The general principles of assessment do not change; however, the emphasis is different, as discussed below.

Four principles are particularly germane to assessment of online instruction. First, the institution must demonstrate how it will achieve its goals, particularly student outcome goals, while maintaining a high standard of quality. Thus, goals must be specific and assessable. Second, the responsibility for the conduct of assessment should be appropriately delegated and shared. Third, assessment should provide assurance that standards of

quality persist at an appropriate level regardless of the medium of the course (i.e., electronic or other) or the methods of instruction adopted. Fourth, the long-term potential of alternative instructional forms (i.e., effectiveness and efficiency) is also germane in an era of shrinking resources.

Of the four principles, the first and second are well understood and require no further comment. The third and fourth are elaborated below.

The concern behind the third principle, as stated by SCHEV, is clear. Students should have reasonable assurance that the course offerings they are taking are accurate, based on published descriptions, regardless of where or in what format the course occurs. In particular, the course objectives in terms of student outcomes will have some similarities for courses having the same name and description, whether the format is online or in the classroom. SCHEV's concern may have state-wide policy implications regarding the sponsorship of programs to deliver educational services in the most efficient manner. Relevant data (e.g., student learning, self-report, and course/degree progress) are needed to make such recommendations. Further, such information can be useful on the institutional level, reinforcing what we are doing or improving teaching and learning.

The fourth emphasis is the long-term potential of instructional innovations like CNU Online. This emphasis is particularly current in Virginia as part of the state mandate for institutional restructuring. CNU Online is part of CNU's institutional restructuring plan; it also began as a special state budget initiative. SCHEV has communicated strong interest in the potential of CNU Online as a model to promote elsewhere in Virginia. Thus, the compelling public interest goes beyond our local implementation. How the local experiment is progressing, through its current development phase towards its promise, is of great interest. Our information may help inform public policy in this area.

Implementation of the SCHEV guidelines at CNU to this point has focused on course-specific comparisons. Such study must continue. However, these guidelines also refer to degree programs and the courses which comprise them. As more students realize their degree objectives, it will become more important to assess the role played by CNU Online in these attainments. In this light, SCHEV's interest in the long-term potential of our online degree program (the Bachelor of Science in Governmental Administration--BSGA) is legitimate.

Since assessment data resulting from the implementation of this plan will have both internal audiences and a primary external audience (i.e. SCHEV), it is important to distinguish the audiences for purposes of dissemination of findings. Not all assessment data

which are useful internally need to be reported to SCHEV. Decisions regarding what is relevant to report, and how to report it, will be based on the current reporting requirements and SCHEV's legitimate concerns as outlined above.

SCHEMATIC OF APPROACH

There are three foci of our approach to online assessment:

1. Student Outcomes;

2. Course-based Comparisons (i.e., online versus classroom);

3. Program Outcomes.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

The first provides the unit of analysis, the traditional coin of assessment, providing the data for analytical comparisons and, ultimately, program and policy decisions. The goals relating to desired student outcomes differ from program goals in this sense: it is the attainment of the former that provide the basis and rationale for the latter. Desired student outcome goals therefore enjoy a primacy that should be kept clearly in view. These goals are found below.

Students enrolled in CNU Online courses will:

1. Learn to read, interpret, and critique written texts.

2. Learn to write clearly, analytically, and persuasively within a conceptual framework.

3. Learn to work effectively with peers in cohesive groups formed around course-related assignments.

4. Learn to use technology.

5. Learn to be an independent learner to acquire knowledge and solve problems.

6. Demonstrate satisfactory knowledge and skills in areas other than those named above (as called for on the course syllabi)

7. Demonstrate, on average, satisfaction and motivation to persist and make progress toward their educational objectives.

However, the goals as stated above are not adequate to guide assessment as they stand. There are two types of corrections that

need to be made, the first technical and the second conceptual. First, although the above provide a good beginning, they are not specific enough as currently stated to guide assessment efforts as well as they might. In addition, faculty critique of the above goals has suggested that some may fit one discipline better than another. Hence, work on goals needs to involve faculty from the relevant disciplines to assure that goals are appropriate to their respective disciplines.

Second, goal attainment in terms of student outcomes in online instruction needs a comparative framework to be most useful and credible. As an educational innovation still controversial within higher education, computer managed instruction must continue to earn its way by demonstrating goal attainment against benchmarks that already have currency and credibility. One way this can happen (for some student outcome goals) is by the use of externally valid tests having national norms to tell where students stand in comparison to their peers throughout the nation. This source of information is limited, however, by not being generally adapted to the electronic environment. When such adaptations have been made, such would be useful. Until then, course-based comparisons (the second focus of our plan explained below) generally are the main practical choice.

However, student outcomes stated specifically enough to permit measurement can have value even when the course-based comparisons have not been made. This can occur, for example, if the audience reviewing the data has enough understanding of context to draw valid inferences from the report. Thus, a more specific and elaborate goal number 4 (use of technology) might lead to data on the frequency of students using various types of technology successfully. Such a report can be useful without providing a course-based comparison. Another valid use for such reports is to generate hypotheses to be tested later in a course-based comparison. For example, a study of writing ability in an online course was conducted during 1995. The findings of the study coupled with information on the amount of writing required suggested the possibility that the particular course engendered writing improvements. A reasonable extension of this study would compare online and comparable classroom courses in improvements of the type suggested by the online study.

COURSE-BASED COMPARISONS

Most course-based comparisons under this plan will be in terms of the above student outcomes. The Office of Assessment and Evaluation will coordinate research and reporting of comparative data. At various times, but on no pre-conceived schedule, studies on one or another of goals 1-5 will be designed and carried out. In order to maintain momentum and meet a recent assessment-related request from SCHEV, a high priority should be given to goal 2,

writing effectiveness. Data regarding goals number 6 and 7 will be gathered and reported every semester. The remainder of this section will focus on these two goals.

Goal 6: Course-Specific Knowledge and Skills

Online instructors' responsibilities will focus particularly on goal number 6 above. This goal refers to the specific disciplinary knowledge and skills taught in the course. However, as written the goal is much too broad for assessment purposes. Specific outcome objectives listed in the course syllabi would provide a more accurate basis for measurement, particularly if satisfaction of the objectives can be tied to types and levels of performance on tests or other tasks to be used in the course.

It will be the responsibility of an instructor who teaches an online course which is also taught as a classroom course to provide meaningful assessment data. (The issue of what happens when the classroom instructor is a different instructor will be discussed below.) The process (described below) will exploit student evaluation practices which already take place; thus instructors' involvement will be merely an extension of what they already do. In order to be most meaningful, those data should provide as fair a comparison as possible between the online and classroom course in terms of mean student performance on significant tasks or tests used in the course. The activity should afford a direct comparison that can be related to the significant objectives of the course. Regarding the timing of the activity, there is no absolute need for the assessment to occur at one stage of the course rather than another as long as that stage is the same for both classes. In general, as in the past most assessment probably will occur at or near the end of the course. The concern is to demonstrate skill and knowledge outcomes defined by course objectives, i.e., these outcomes as they would be at the end of a course.

The issue of value-added versus summative assessment should be addressed. Pre- and post-testing to obtain value-added data for a course or course units was tried one year ago, and the results were not encouraging. By this is meant that the results were such that the validity of the process itself was highly questionable. There may have been various reasons these results occurred. A minimum conclusion, supported by assessment literature, is that useful value-added measurements are difficult to obtain. Instructors are free to gather pre- and posttest data for their own use as long as the technical means are available. However, in general that approach to assessment will not be restored.

Assessment comparison data may come from an entire test or task or from some significant part of the activity. In case only a part of the activity is used, that part may be graded or not

graded, as the instructor prefers. However, in no case should it be distinguishable from the other parts as an ungraded assessment activity. That is, the assessment should be "embedded" to insure maximum student effort in the activity. If a whole activity is used, it is highly recommended that it count as part of the course grade. Grading helps such activities to be "embedded" in another sense, i.e. within the course. In general, this produces better results, since ungraded activities stand out from the rest of the course. They do not elicit maximum performance and therefore are of limited value for comparative purposes.

Valid comparisons can occur only if the same (or very similar) activity provides the basis. While various activities can and have provided the basis of comparison (problem sets, essays, objective tests, etc.), whatever format is chosen should remain constant. Regarding objective testing, in a computer-managed environment the potential for automatic scoring and results analysis exists. This option can be useful and should not be ignored in the future. (Such has been done in CNU Online. The issue of whether the software can be provided and adapted to fit an instructor's specific request is a resource issue; it is beyond the scope of this plan.) However, that potential need not dictate the use of that format, if it is available. For now (unless and until specific approaches to evaluation within particular courses are mandated by College deans), instructors are free to select their own desired format.

The practical arrangements for comparative assessments are also affected by control and access. In particular, two cases should be considered separately.

(1) Same course taught both online and in the classroom by the same professor.

This is the clearest case in which the instructor should provide comparative data. As nearly as possible, the instructor should keep conditions the same. It could be argued that conditions are really identical only when students from both classes are required to come in and participate in an on-campus classroom. For now, there is no objection to this arrangement. However, since students enroll in online courses in part to avoid scheduling visits to the campus, this arrangement is discouraged as a long-term solution. Participation under duress can change the testing conditions perhaps more than the adaptation of the activity to the online medium. Therefore, the instructor is urged to make the adaptation by designing the tasks to be closely comparable, if not strictly identical.

The problem of security has been raised--i.e., students from one class learning about the activity from students in the other class. Such a problem is theoretically always with us. There are methods to mitigate the problem, however. First, embedding the

assessment task as a fraction of the larger activity reduces the likelihood of a leak affecting the assessment results. Second, spacing the two classes' activities close together in time also controls the problem. Another approach would be to schedule the on-campus assessment activity after the online activity had been completed. That ploy would frankly give away the theoretical advantage to the on-campus class. Therefore, if the online class performed as well as (or better than) the on-campus group, the case for comparable outcomes would be strengthened. Since it is the online method which is still proving its merits, this order would be preferred as it would eliminate security problems as an explanation of results favorable to online.

(2) Same course taught both online and in the classroom but by different professors.

This case is much less clear. At present the cooperation of the classroom instructor in providing comparative data has not been mandated. Moreover, with a difference in instructors typically comes many other differences which can influence the comparability of the assessments; e.g., how "embedded" the activity is and its timing in the course. Nevertheless, the online instructor is encouraged to ask a classroom colleague to include brief but significant assessment activities, as similar as possible to ones planned by the online professor. "Investigator bias" can play a role in comparisons if the investigator has a clear preference for or against online instruction; and some online instructors may favor online instruction to the extent of wanting the comparison to come out well for online--or at least so a critic might suggest. One advantage of comparisons with different instructors would be to weaken such a criticism. For this reason, it would be desirable to arrange at least a few of these comparisons.

On the first page of this plan, it states that the assessment procedures "will satisfy appropriate standards of methodological rigor and scholarly integrity." Often when a mosaic of individual studies comes together, methodological shortcomings or threats to validity in one study are overcome by the larger composite study. This is the same principle illustrated by a team of judges at a sports competition. Any one judge would appear unreliable, even erratic, but combined with others a more stable rating system emerges. On this reasoning, instructors should not discount their contributions as unimportant if, because they are close to the data, they see in stark detail all of the problems. Sometimes the individual who organizes the results of little studies into one larger study is the first to see the whole picture. Combined, the results may be significant and publishable. Therefore, as part of this assessment plan a collaborative venture is proposed. Instructors who participate in the comparative study (including perhaps one or more classroom instructors) will be asked to collaborate on presentations or publications based on the data. (Such plans would not preclude online faculty from doing smaller

scale studies for presentation as sole authors.) All collaborators must agree to provide not only data, but their insights and expertise toward the appropriate interpretation of these data. Authorship and order of authorship, as in all such cases, would be determined by contributors, when possible in advance.

Goal 7: Course-related Satisfaction and Persistence

The primary instrument for measurement of course-related satisfaction will continue to be the Online Instruction Evaluation Survey (Online IES). First, however, the scope of this survey needs to be clarified; this will eliminate both confusion and one obstacle to the effective use and availability of an important type of data. Prior to now, the title "Online Instruction Evaluation Survey" has applied to a two-part instrument. The first part was nearly identical to the standard IES which is used every term in virtually every undergraduate course at CNU. The second part consists of questions which are specifically designed to apply to online courses. They were written with assessment, and improvement of learning and teaching, in mind. (See the copy in Appendix A.)

The two-part Online IES currently in use is given every semester in virtually every class. Primarily, the first part provides directly comparable data for online and classroom courses which are the same. However, these data in the first part were never intended for assessment purposes but for course and instructor evaluation. They do not work well for assessment purposes (there is some limited usefulness of a few questions); in any case access to the data is severely limited. Those limitations are imposed (understandably so) because of the sensitive and privileged nature of the data, which play a key role in the faculty evaluation process.

Including two parts together as one instrument has resulted in poor access to the data which are quite important for assessment. It has also confused and complicated the standard IES process for online classes. Various people concerned with the online program have worked to resolve this confusion and provide better access to the data. To improve the situation, the two parts of the former Online IES need to be separated and given at different times. The IES which is used for course and instructor evaluation should be limited to the first part. The processing of these data, after delivery to the Computer Center, can follow exactly the same procedures as used for classroom courses. There is reason to believe this process will work better without the confusing addition of a second part.

The second part (appropriately re-named to reduce confusion) can then be administered entirely under the control and jurisdiction of the CNU Online administration. There need be no impediments to its distribution to faculty. (Whether the faculty members choose to include the data in their dossiers for evaluation

purposes is immaterial for assessment; but they are free to do so.) More importantly, the data also will be used in an ongoing study designed to compare the same online and classroom courses in terms of the questions. (Graduate courses will not be included in this study since they now make use of a separate "Graduate IES.") To carry out this study will require cooperation among instructors teaching each type of course. Specific plans for such a study need to be developed.

In addition to these data, a comparative retention study will be carried out, similar to one done in 1995 and reported in the Assessment Report for CNU Online. It is important to continue to keep track of students' post-enrollment persistence in courses and how it compares between online and classroom courses.

Supplementary Data Related to Course Outcomes

1. There is another type of "course outcome" which is a way of estimating the effect of particular courses as a whole on other courses as a whole. Although this method has been applied to only a few courses, the applicable number of courses should grow. The essence of the method is to examine the question of how students performed in courses for which the prerequisites could be taken in the preceding semester either online or in the classroom. Grades in the second (or "target") course were looked at comparatively. This method provided some useful information, and therefore will be repeated by fall, 1996.

2. Supplementary tests having a clear potential for illuminating online retention and/or learning may be given to online students. However, the cooperation of participating online faculty and students, and the relevant departments, should be obtained. These activities should be developed and announced prior to the beginning of the semester in which the activity is to take place. Other guidelines, established by the Online Faculty Advisory Committee, should be consulted. It is the responsibility of faculty conducting such research to demonstrate its potential usefulness based on data already collected. (Should unresolved honest differences of opinion arise regarding potential usefulness or necessity of gathering particular data, and/or the proper application of guidelines, the issue may be referred to the Provost for resolution.) In all cases, students' needs and rights will be protected, and in general, there should be no greater infringement on online students' time and efforts than on classroom students'.

3. Background data are indirectly related to course outcomes. Assessment should continue to rely on a statistical description of students who choose to enroll in on-line courses (i.e. age, gender, ethnic, prior enrollment, GPA, classification, other background). This information may be used in some analyses

to make sure any differences observed (e.g., in writing ability) are not due to background characteristics; or alternatively, the data may be used statistically to "control" for background characteristics so that the net differences might be inferred.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

Program outcomes are defined as those desired end states which the program exists to bring into being. A focus on program outcomes differs from the other two foci--student outcomes and course-based outcomes. The former depends on gathering data of the latter two types; but by themselves student and course-based outcomes will not demonstrate that the program as a whole is achieving the ends for which it was designed. By "program" two things are included under this category. The first is the entire computer-managed course effort at CNU, i.e. CNU Online. Another important meaning is "degree program," of which currently just one (i.e., the BSGA) is offered.

Goals and Objectives

As might be expected, some work needs to be done to clarify what the program outcomes are. The following statements have been published officially and can serve, initially, as guides. The first list of six goals comes from the CNU Online Mission statement:

1. Provide a high quality computer communications system that delivers undergraduate and graduate courses,
2. Provide pedagogical guidance and training,
3. Provide administrative support,
4. Provide support services for quality instruction and research,
5. Provide quality faculty,
6. Serve a student audience that needs a flexible format.

These are proper goals, derived from the mission statement to guide policy and practice. However, they are at a high level of generality in comparison to outcomes statements. They also lean toward input-type or antecedent conditions which are presumed, reasonably, to be required for a quality program; hence the word "provide" recurs five times in the list (and the last item, which might have been worded "provide a flexible format for learning" is really the same type).

Another list, (from the initial budget initiative, restated in the first assessment plan), should be examined:

1. Degree productivity will be enhanced and student retention will be increased.

2. Accessibility for students with financial and mobility

problems will be enhanced.

3. Cost effectiveness and operational efficiency will be enhanced.

4. Student learning and academic advising will be enhanced by analysis of archival information from the digital environment.

The above list is more promising from an outcomes perspective. For example, degree productivity and student retention as influenced by CNU Online can be measured fairly straightforwardly. However, this list of "program goals" may be dated and should be reviewed before making further plans to assess them.

The importance of the above as program goals would be difficult to deny. (See the earlier discussion of state and regional guidelines.) The fourth one might appear at first to duplicate part of the student outcomes goals. However, there is another way to understand this goal. Since a number of students have taken many courses online (and the potential exists for a student to take all of his/her courses online), the question arises, what is the cumulative effect of this medium of instruction when summed over time, over students, and over courses? The answer(s) to this question should not be assumed at the outset; it is a question for serious investigation.

The BSGA Program

With specific reference to the degree program (the BSGA), more information on program quality and degree progress (as influenced by CNU Online) should be gathered. It is appropriate to have plans toward that end. Rather than precluding the role that the Department of Government and Public Affairs should have in those plans, the following points are offered to help open that discussion. I have three preliminary points.

1. There are very few "pure" online BSGA students. Increasingly, there may be few "pure" BSGA classroom-course students as well. Therefore, evaluation of degree quality is not a simple comparison of students in one group versus another.

2. The Department of Government and Public Affairs should not be burdened with another self-study in addition to the one they already experience once every 6 years. However, they should recognize the need for reporting accurate data on this issue prior to their next program review. The Department will need to participate in the review of data to assure that interpretations and recommendations are supportable.

3. Some external review (i.e., from outside the department) would be helpful and should be built in.

With these points in mind, I outline the following plan:

1. All studies done in the context of this revised Assessment Plan for CNU Online should include, to the extent possible, breakdowns for BSGA students and BSGA courses.

2. Capstone experiences, if available, should provide comparable data for all students. Fair evaluation of such data would be blind with respect to how many online courses the student has taken. Performance data will be correlated with students' records, i.e., the number and type of online courses taken.

3. As needed, a separate report will be developed by Assessment and Evaluation focusing on the BSGA online degree program. The Department will participate in the review of this document. An outside reviewer will also take part.

ISSUES OF IMPLEMENTATION

To be successfully implemented, any assessment plan requires the proper attention to leadership and support. This is particularly true when demands on both faculty and administration are difficult and growing. The Director of Assessment and Evaluation will remain the overall coordinator. However, the involvements of the academic deans and, ultimately, the Provost are required to assure effective cooperation. Accordingly, deans and the relevant department chairs will be responsible to the Provost for phases of the implementation of this plan which involve faculty and departments under their supervision.

An appropriate reporting mechanism is needed through which assessment activities and results can regularly be reported to the Provost. According to the Provost, beginning this year the departmental annual reports to deans and provost will include assessment updates and summaries of significant assessment data. A logical extension of this idea would be to include significant online involvement and a brief relevant assessment summary. As significant activity, such involvement should be a part of the annual report. In essence, departments' online assessment activities should be regarded as significant and on a par with their other assessment activities. Deans will be responsible to assure corrective actions at the departmental level if such are necessary.

The approximate time-table of implementation is as follows for the various elements of this plan:

Activity	By (date):
1. Review and revise student outcome goals and program goals	September, 1996
2. Course-based comparisons	December, 1996 and May, 1997
3. Separation of IES from rest of online student opinion survey	April, 1996
4. Creation of new student survey, unique to online courses and based on revised student outcome goals	July, 1996
5. Ongoing significant assessment activities to supplement the above (Assessment & Evaluation)	Each semester, 1996-97
6. Reporting cycle (SCHEV) (Assessment & Evaluation)	Biennial, with interim update.

The Provost has reviewed and approved this plan. The Provost will also review and approve proposed time tables for the implementation of this plan and any reports which may be necessary.

APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION SURVEY (IES) -- ADAPTED FOR ONLINE INSTRUCTION--REVISED APRIL, 1996

Items numbered 1 through 16 use the following response choices: "Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Neutral, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree."

1. The course the instructor presented was consistent with the course description in the catalog.

2. The instructor's messages and assignments showed evidence of careful thought and preparation.

3. The instructor's grading policies were clearly explained early in the term.

4. The instructor's grading procedures were fair.

5. Assignments, course contributions, and tests were graded in a timely fashion.

6. Assignments and/or tests covered knowledge, application, or reasoning that could be expected on the basis of course content.

7. The instructor was readily accessible and encouraged students to seek help when needed.

8. The instructor demonstrated command of the subject matter of the course.

9. The instructor's presentations of the course material and messages were clear and understandable.

10. The instructor demonstrated interest and enthusiasm for the subject matter.

11. I found the instructor to be intellectually motivating and stimulated learning.

12. The instructor consistently devoted the time necessary to make this course a valuable learning experience for me.

13. I found the professor to be an effective teacher in this course.

14. The subject matter of this course is difficult.

15. The subject matter of this course is interesting.

16. The subject matter of the course is a valuable part of my

education.

17. What is your present class standing? [Freshman] [Sophomore] [Junior] [Senior] [Other]

18. Please mark one:
Response choices:
[Male] [Female]

Please mark one:
[Asian] [Black] [Native American] [White] [Hispanic] [other]

19. What is your age?
Response choices:
[18 or less] [19-22] [23-30] [over 30]

20. What grade do you expect to receive in the course?
Response choices:
[A] [B] [C] [D] [F] [other]

21. What percent of class requirements (assignments, discussion, etc.) have you participated in?
[100%] [90-99%] [80-89%] [70-79%] [less than 70%]

22. Which answer of the three below best explains why you enrolled in this course?
Response choices:
[distribution] [major field] [elective]

Any additional comments can be placed here: [Space reserved for comments]

STUDENT OPINIONS ABOUT ONLINE COURSES--BEING REVISED

The following items were developed for online classes in 1994-95. The items are currently being reviewed and revised.

All items use the following response choices in the following scale: "Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Neutral, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree."

1. The course developed my problem solving skills.

2. The course enabled me to draw reasonable inferences from observations.

3. The course developed my ability to integrate and synthesize information.

4. The course developed my ability to use facts to support opinion.

5. The course developed my ability to appreciate the historical development of the subject matter addressed in the course.

6. The course developed my tolerance for other viewpoints.

7. The course developed my ability to work productively with others.

8. The course developed my ability to resolve controversies.

9. The course helped me learn the vocabulary and concepts of the subject.

10. The course helped me learn the objectives and values of the subject.

11. The course developed my reading skills.

12. The course developed my writing skills.

13. The course developed my telecommunications skills.

14. The course developed my computer software skills.

15. It is more <u>convenient</u> for me to take this course online instead of in a classroom.

16. Online courses <u>are necessary</u> for me to complete an undergraduate degree.

17. Cost savings (work, scheduling, travel, etc.) was a factor in my taking online courses.

REFERENCE

1. Ridley, D. R., Williams, H., Miller, B., and Teschner, G. Assessment Plan for CNU Online, Resources in Education, ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation, in press.